



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mr. Herrmann, that those essays were written by Johannes, not Albrecht, von Eyb. There are, however, three more treatises in that appendix which Mr. Herrmann attributes to Albrecht. We are told that we possess the official speeches, both of the 'doctorandus' and of the 'promotor,' delivered when Albrecht took his doctor's degree. But the reasons offered for such a statement are not at all convincing, though it *may* be as Mr. Herrmann says. It is certain that more than one was made a doctor of civil law under Sacco, and that Albrecht was not the only one who came from far away to take that academic honor, and, besides, the humanists were so generally fond of exaggerations, that we are not compelled to take their high-sounding phrases literally.

Now for the last and, perhaps, the most important essay, 'Clarissimarum feminarum laudacio,' as we find it in the appendix of Albrecht's large Latin book. As Mr. Herrmann himself recognizes (p.vi), Albrecht belonged to a group of men whose historic task and merit it was to introduce into Germany as many as possible of the treasures of classical literature, without changes either in form or contents. It seems to us as if there were too much independence and individuality of style and thought in that 'laudacio,' to let us attribute its authorship to Albrecht. We give him the honor of the second revised edition as it appears in the Munich cod. lat. 650, but not of the original conception as it exists in the above-named appendix. If we do not accept Mr. Herrmann's hypothesis on this point, the conclusions drawn from it must also fall; namely, that Niklas von Wyle in his sixteenth translation largely plagiarized Eyb's work. We believe that he simply used the same Latin original as Eyb, and the same explanation must be given in regard to the other passage which Wyle is alleged to have borrowed from Eyb. Those pleas for full liberty in literary subjects, especially about love in its more sensual aspects, did certainly not originate in Germany; they must have formed part of the apologies that the first humanists used against their narrow scholastic assailants. Both Wyle and Eyb went back to the same original, which they found among their humanistic

writings, gathered during their stay in Italy.

MAX BLAU.

Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.

THE ENGLISH RELIGIOUS DRAMA.

The English Religious Drama. By Katherine Lee Bates. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1893. 8vo, pp. 254.

THIS work embodies a brief course of lectures delivered in the Summer School of Colorado Springs, July, 1893. These lectures have been recast as five chapters, the first of which deals with the Latin Passion plays and Saint plays, the second and third survey the Miracle or Mystery plays of England, and the fourth discusses the dramatic values of these plays. The fifth chapter treats of the Moralities, and recognizes the dependence of the Elizabethan drama upon these antecedent dramatic forms. A bibliography is appended, which is in large part a reproduction of Stoddard's "References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries," but contains also some additional information in the form of notes.

It must be said that, viewed as lectures for a Summer School, these seem exceptionally compact and comprehensive,—a pretty severe course for a summer audience. The subject matter is foreign to the interests of the general student and is not easily unified, but Miss Bates' agreeable style effectually preserves her book from tediousness, although I fear that in a few places, perhaps in the *résumé* of the cycles, interest may have flagged.

The author has collected about all the information current among the authorities prior to and including ten Brink. These writers, with few exceptions, gathered striking, but often unrelated, facts about the plays, viewing them rather as curiosities of literature than as important works. They were not careful to distinguish modes of presentation that were continental from such as were English, or to mark the differences between plays that did not belong even to the same century. That an author, working at second-hand with such authorities, should occasionally draw a false inference or give undue emphasis, is to be expected. The reader, who is conversant with the chaotic accumulation of data with

which our author had to do, cannot but admire the skill with which she has given the semblance of connection and continuity to much that came to her without form.

The fair, yet cautious, interpretation so frequently met with in the book, reveals the pains-taking student, but renders it still more a matter for regret that much of the analytical study that has been expended upon the plays during the last few years seems strangely to have escaped notice. Thus, Hohlfeld, *Anglia*, vol. xi, would have been suggestive. Miss Toulmin Smith's discussion of the interrelations of the plays of Abraham and Isaac would surely have modified, somewhat, the statements regarding these plays, and the articles in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. vii, Nos. 3 and 6, together with the doctoral thesis, "Studies in the English Mystery Plays," published in 'The Transactions of the Conn. Academy of Sciences' Vol. ix, might have led to different conclusions in some instances.

It may be well to mention a few particulars in which later studies would seem to modify the old positions. A closer examination of the gild records reveals more clearly the unique character of the cycles by the craft guilds, and the great expense they entailed upon the guilds of the town. The natural inference is that such cycles would be few in number, and that many towns would content themselves with processional pageants, which could be made at small expense. The presumption (p. 141) that isolated plays "were but leaves from the cyclic play-book" of some town is, in my opinion, a presumption contrary to the evidence.

Again, ten Brink's position regarding the Dublin cycle, which is adopted by our author, is probably untenable. The French 'mystère mimée' sheds light upon the Aberdeen tableaux, and these interpret the evidence of the so-called Dublin cycle. It is probable that the plays of Dublin were all isolated plays, and that the 'cycle' of Dublin plays, so often referred to, was simply a series of processional tableaux.

The bearing of the Royal Entry upon the absence of a craft gild cycle in London, is an instance where broader study might have modified a statement. The ceremony of the

Royal Entry was a great financial burden upon the guilds of London, and necessitated outlay whenever the sovereign returned home, or a friendly monarch paid the city a visit. So onerous was the burden that the city of Canterbury, which was subject to frequent calls as lying on the route to Normandy, entertained outside the city walls, thus escaping the heavier exactions of the Royal Entry. It would seem that the guilds of London found the Royal Entry and the Lord Mayor's show so great an expense that they were unwilling to support a gild cycle. If we also grant that the cycle of the Parish clerks was probably modeled on the cycles of the Puy of Normandy, and had no connection with the plays of the craft guilds, it will no longer seem so strange, as the author thinks, p. 89, that no London cycle has been preserved.

The more careful study given of late to the Latin liturgical plays has led to a clearer understanding of the genesis of the cyclic play. One fails to see how the Saint plays could have contributed materially (p. 32) to the transition from liturgical plays to cyclic. The researches of Milchsack and Lange have made the process very clear by which the short liturgical plays were expanded and connected to form a series of plays. The Saint plays, doubtless, owed their origin to and fostered the popular passion for plays, but they ran their course in comparative independence of the cyclic plays, until the decadence of the Mystery was well begun.

It might be mentioned in passing that the author follows Klein in speaking (p. 7) of living tableaux in the fifth century. It would seem that Schaff, 'History of the Christian Church,' Vol. ii, p. 274, takes safer ground in referring to the same as allegorical pictures.

The statement (p. 23) that the quotation which follows is a description of Corpus Christi, as observed in London, drawn by the grudging hand of an Elizabethan Protestant, is one of those unfortunate slips that may chance to any of us. Hone was probably the trusted authority, and his slipshod statement misled our author. The quotation in question is from Googe's 'The Papish Kingdome,' the fourth book. Now, Googe's work is a translation of 'Regnum Papisticum' which was

written by Thomas Naogeorgus or Kirchmayer, a German, and was published at Basel, 1553 and 1559. It is not likely that Naogeorgus is referring particularly to the celebration in London.

But a truce to criticism. The points in question are for the most part such as concern the specialist alone. This book will render an important service, if from it the people learn to regard the Mysteries, not as an unaccountable and well-nigh blasphemous product of an ungodly age, but as the work of sincere and reverent men, and as the most faithful mirror we possess of the age in which they were written. Miss Bates has given us the first popular *résumé* of the subject from the stand-point of the unprejudiced student. The lectures will prove interesting and instructive to the general reader, and will be very serviceable to the specialist as a compact presentation of much widely scattered, but important information.

CHARLES DAVIDSON.

University of Indiana.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

Vie de Saint François d'Assise, par PAUL SABATIER, seizième édition, Paris: Fischbacher, 8vo, pp. cxxvi, 418, 1894.

STUDENTS of modern languages and literature cannot afford to let this book go unread. Its theme is in reality the one that interests them more than any other; namely, the specific elements of thought by which the Middle Ages modified ancient languages and literature and made them modern. It was through Italy that the narrow, but essential, rivulet of classical tradition wound its way downward towards the broader levels of the Renaissance. The new potentialities imparted to this stream in mediæval times have one central character,—they derive their force from an attempt to apply to life the ethical maxims of Christ. M. Sabatier evidently belongs to the school of French critics whose happy task it has been to reveal the human and poetical heart in Christ. His book might be entitled: "Francis of Assisi not churchman, but poet." And it is, in a satisfactory and legitimate sense, an application of Renan's method in the 'Vie de

Jésus' to this thirteenth-century hero, who was in person so true an imitation of Christ. If it seems to anyone that these observations are commonplace, and that such a discovery is not large enough to justify the writing of a new life of St. Francis, after the works of Thode, Hase, Chérancé, and Mrs. Oliphant, let him consider whether any man, saint, mystic, scholar, or priest, can contest with Francis the honor of being the first to make a systematic and lifelong effort to apply literally the Christian maxims of poverty and non-resistance, at the same time preserving a sweetness of disposition, a sense of nature, a poetical spirit, a music of the soul, which are no less truly Christian than the maxims themselves. It is for having been the first to adopt both practically and poetically the social and economic teachings of Christ, that St. Francis is not merely the most charming and lovable, but the most influential character of his time. He is the father of Italian literature, not merely because of those few lines of his which we account the first important monument of Italian speech, but because he struck the key in which its loftiest music was to be sounded. And this is, perhaps, why Dante dwells so long upon him, as if to pay his indebtedness to him, not alone as spiritual leader, but as one fit to be crowned,

col nome che più dura e più onora.

For one who has read appreciatively M. Sabatier's book, and plucked from it this core of truth that in St. Francis poet and mystic met, and that in his ears the myriad-voiced music of nature was divine, it is a grateful and imperative task to call attention to his fatherhood of Italian literature, and if that appear a truism, to make it seem less so. His using the vernacular is in keeping with all the effort of his spirit, which was humble, popular, helpful, and disposed to employ, and thereby dignify, the commonplaces of life,—water, sunshine, the speech of every day.

M. Sabatier has another thesis, which he has not worked out so well. It is that the church, jealous of the influence of St. Francis, forced him into a closer organic relation with herself than he desired, and that, therefore, the Franciscan orders were, even during his lifetime, a